

Remarks

The present application includes claims 1-4 and 6-22. Claims 1-4 and 6-22 have been rejected by the Examiner. By this Response, claims 1, 14, 17, 20, 21, and 22 have been amended.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1, 14, 17, 20, 21, and 22 have been amended to recite that all values of each prize set are displayed on the game display for the player to view and select a prize set. Thus, the player knows the potential prize outcomes and can evaluate risk vs. reward given the differing volatility of the different prize sets. All prize outcomes for each prize set are displayed in their entirety for the player to see. The Applicant notes that the claims recite multiple prize **sets** including multiple prize outcomes, not just multiple prize awards. As recited in claims 1 and 14, even though each prize set has a different volatility, the total theoretical return to the player is the same regardless of the prize set the player chooses. The Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art of record fails to disclose at least these limitations. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the Applicant requests allowance of independent claims 1, 14, 17, 20, 21, and 22, as well as their associated dependent claims 2-4, 6-13, 15-16, and 18-19.

Claim Rejections

Claim 1-4, 6-13, 17, 18 and 20-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baerlocher (US 6,776,711 B1) (hereinafter Baerlocher '711) in

view of Baerlocher et al. (US 6,569,015 B1) (hereinafter Baerlocher '015). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reasons discussed below.

As agreed upon by the Examiner, Baerlocher '711 does not disclose that the prize outcomes of each prize set are displayed to the player prior to the player selecting a prize set.

Rather, in Baerlocher '711, the gaming device contains a display that prompts the player to select one of a plurality of *pick buttons*. See, e.g., Abstract; Figure 5; column 3, lines 35-40. When the player selects a *pick button*, the *game assigns an award set to each pick button*. See, e.g., Abstract; Figure 5; column 3, lines 52-58. The game *then* displays each of the awards in the award sets so that the player can easily recognize the assignments and *only then* see the awards the player could have obtained. See, e.g., Abstract; Figure 5; column 3, lines 55-58. The game randomly chooses one of the awards from each of the award sets and displays the chosen awards. See, e.g., Abstract; Figure 5; column 4, lines 1-5. The player's award for any given level is thus the selected award of the selected award set of the picked or chosen pick button. See, e.g., Abstract; Figure 5; column 4, lines 6-8.

As shown above, in Baerlocher '711, the player has no real choice of outcome possibilities (simply a random coincidence) and no opportunity to review and evaluation all prize outcomes in each of a plurality of prize sets prior to selection of a prize set. As discussed in the present application, providing different prize sets and displaying the information to the player for player selection allows the player to evaluate which set offers him or her the best odds of winning and provides more challenge and stimulation for the player. This component of game play is simply missing from Baerlocher '711.

Moving on to the Baerlocher '015 patent, the Examiner asserts that Baerlocher '015 "discloses this feature such that a player is presented with two prize sets, a Value prize set and a Multiplier prize set as shown in Figure 1, that display all possible outcomes of both prize sets prior to a player making a selection of a prize set."

The Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to appreciate the contrast between different prize sets having different volatility and the system of the Baerlocher '015 patent which allows a user to change *a value and a multiplier for that value*, as shown in Figure 1. Among other things, the Examiner mistakenly views the wheels shown in Figure 1 as depicting a Value prize set and a Multiplier prize set. In Baerlocher '015, the player may choose to change the value or the multiplier but the player does not know what the new value will be and cannot make a decision based on known information about different prize sets and their volatility. The *prize sets* are not displayed to the player, and the player has no idea what the *prize sets* and their possible outcomes are. The player is not shown this set of information and allowed to evaluate it prior to deciding whether to accept the value and multipliers given or change them and gamble on a different result.

In the presently pending claims, a gaming system provides different prize sets to the player and displays the information regarding each of the prize sets in its entirety to the player for player selection, thus allowing the player to evaluate which set offers him or her the best odds of winning and providing more challenge and stimulation for the player. This component of game play is simply missing from Baerlocher '015, as it is from Baerlocher '711.

Thus, a combination of Baerlocher '711 and Baerlocher '015 would still be missing at least those elements recited in the pending claims. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the current rejection of claims 1-13, 17, 18, and 20-22 should not be allowed to stand. The Applicant submits that in view of cited art of record, these claims should be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Claims 14-16 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baerlocher '711, Baerlocher '015, and further in view of Baerlocher et al. (US 5,788,573) (hereinafter Baerlocher '573). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reasons discussed below.

As discussed above, neither the Baerlocher '711 patent nor the Baerlocher '015 patent, taken alone or in combination, teaches, suggests, or motivates the combination of limitations recited in independent claims 1, 17, and 20-22. Additionally, as noted by the Examiner, Baerlocher '711 and Baerlocher '015 do not disclose that the selected wheel is enlarged relative to any non-selected wheels.

As discussed in prior responses, Baerlocher '573 is directed to a wheel of fortune game "which is compatible with small prize odds such as odds of one in one million or more" (see column 4, lines 45-50). One of the methods used to achieve this is to provide a "hierarchy of wheels of fortune wherein the result from one wheel spin has an effect on the other wheel spin... providing odds of winning the grand prize which is a product of the odds on two or more different spins and thus diminishing the overall odds."

Like Baerlocher '711 and Baerlocher '015, Baerlocher '573 fails to disclose providing different prize sets to the player and displaying the information regarding each

of the prize sets in its entirety to the player for player selection, thus allowing the player to evaluate which set offers him or her the best odds of winning and providing more challenge and stimulation for the player. In Baerlocher '573, the player does not know what the values or outcomes in different prize sets are and cannot make a decision to select a prize set based on known information about different prize sets and their volatility. The *prize sets* are not displayed to the player, and the player has no idea what the *prize sets* and their possible outcomes are. The player is not shown this set of information and allowed to evaluate it prior to deciding whether to accept the value and multipliers given or change them and gamble on a different result. This component of game play is simply missing from Baerlocher '573, as it is from Baerlocher '015 and from Baerlocher '711. Thus, adding the disclosure of the Baerlocher '573 patent to any combination of the Baerlocher '015 and Baerlocher '711 patents similarly fails to teach, suggest, or motivate the limitations recited in the presently pending claims.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14-16 and 19 should be allowable over the cited art of record.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowability is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicant can be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the Applicant at the number below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees, including the fee for a one-month extension of time, or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account of MHM, Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 31, 2007

/Christopher N. George/
Christopher N. George
Reg. No. 51,728

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 W. Madison Street
34th Floor
Chicago, IL 60661
Phone (312) 775-8000
Fax (312) 775-8100